REMARKS

The seven claims submitted for examination in this application have been made subject to a provisional restriction requirement. The Official Action avers that these seven claims represent five distinct and independent inventions denoted as Groups I to V. Groups I-IV are all directed to Claims 1 to 5 wherein the radicals have differing meanings. Group V is directed to Claims 6 and 7, drawn to methods of use of the compounds of Claims 1-5.

Applicants respectfully have elected Group I for prosecution on the merits in this application. This election is made with traverse.

At the outset, applicants strongly argue that the five groups of claims do not begin to encompass all the compounds within the contemplation of Claims 1-5. For example, Claims 1 to 5 have three meanings for the radical Y. However, all the inventions within the scope of the present application define only one of these meanings. Similarly, X, in all four groups, define only five meanings whereas X, in Claim 1, encompasses a minimum of twenty-one meanings. Moreover R^1 and R^2, taken together with a nitrogen atom to which they are attached, can form a cyclic structure having four meanings. However, Groups I-IV encompass only two of these meanings.

In summary, the restriction requirement imposed in the Official Action has defined the meanings of the radicals so that they not encompass all the meanings within the contemplation of the claims of the present application. As such, applicants have no idea how many alleged distinct and independent inventions are encompassed by the restriction requirement of the outstanding Official Action.

The above remarks emphasize the improper nature of the restriction requirement of record. The Official Action imposes the instant restriction requirement under Rule 13.1 of the

Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT). Rule 13.1 states that a restriction is proper when more than a single general inventive concept is encompassed by the claims of an application.

Rule 13.2 of the PCT, in turn, defines the circumstances under which the requirement of unity of invention is met in an application. That occurs when there is a technical relationship among the inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding technical features. A "special technical feature" is defined as a feature that defines a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

In the present application the inventions of Groups I to IV each define compounds which all inhibit amyloid aggregation. That all of the compounds within the contemplation of Claims 1 to 5 inhibit amyloid aggregation establishes the error in attempting to "slice and dice" the compounds within the contemplation of the present invention to an infinitely large group, given the above remarks, wherein the radicals defined in Groups I-IV do not encompass all the compounds within the contemplation of the claims.

The Official Action admits to the commonality of a 2-thio, 4-oxo substituted 1,3-thiazole group, which in and of itself is indicative of a class of compounds, given their common attribute of inhibiting amyloid aggregation. Applicants aver that the inclusion of this unique group, when taken with their common utility, evidences a special technical feature.

The above remarks establish the unitary nature of all the claims currently in this application. Reconsideration and removal of the provisional restriction requirement, followed by prompt examination on the merits of all the claims currently in this application, Claims 1-

7, is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Marvin Bressler
Registration No. 25,132
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
516-742-4343
MB:ml